

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONSERVATION CONGRESS,  
  
                                Plaintiff,  
  
          v.  
  
UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE,  
UNITED STATES FISH AND  
WILDLIFE SERVICE,  
  
                                Defendants,  
  
                                &  
  
TRINITY RIVER LUMBER COMPANY,  
  
                                Defendant  
                                Intervenor.

No. 2:13-cv-01977-JAM-DB

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION AND  
DEFENDANTS' CROSS MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

And yesterday the bird of night did sit  
Even at noon-day upon the marketplace  
Hooting and shrieking.

- William Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, act 1, sc. 2.

This litigation concerns the continuing viability of the  
revered Northern spotted owl ("NSO") and whether it may soon  
portend its own demise at the hands of its protector, the federal  
government. The United States Forest Service ("USFS") plans to  
execute the Smokey Project ("Project"), a proposal to administer  
fuel and vegetative treatments intended to further habitat and

1 fire management goals in the Mendocino National Forest ("MNF")  
2 and contribute to the MNF's timber production goals. The USFS  
3 engaged with interested parties as it developed the Project,  
4 leading to its decision to adopt the proposal. Conservation  
5 Congress ("Plaintiff") participated throughout that process,  
6 advocating for the NSO and its old-growth habitat. It now  
7 challenges the USFS's final decisions, as well as the Fish and  
8 Wildlife Service's ("FWS"; collectively "Defendants")  
9 contributions to the end result. As described below, the Court  
10 agrees that the USFS failed to meet some of its statutory  
11 obligations.

#### 12 I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

13 The USFS began scoping for the Smokey Project ("Project") in  
14 December 2009. See FS-3643. Plaintiff submitted its first set  
15 of comments the following March and continued communicating with  
16 the USFS over the next year. USFS Administrative Record ("FS")-  
17 3627, 3599-3626, FS-3585. In July 2010, the USFS released the  
18 Draft Environmental Assessment and opened the 30-day Objection  
19 Period. FS-1727, 1645. The Administrative Record indicates that  
20 the USFS and Plaintiff had a conference call concerning the  
21 project, followed by Plaintiff's submission of its first written  
22 Objections in August, which were followed by an in person  
23 Objection Resolution meeting. FS-1636, 1557, 1546.

24 The USFS also consulted with the FWS about the Project's  
25 impacts on endangered and threatened species. From Fall 2009 to  
26 early 2011, the agencies conferred over whether or not the  
27 Project would adversely affect the NSO. See Fish and Wildlife  
28 Service Administrative Record ("FWS")-1-107; FS-18874-94. This

1 determination dictates whether a formal—and more extensive—  
2 consultation between the agencies is required pursuant to the  
3 Endangered Species Act. See infra Part III.D. The FWS concluded  
4 that the Project “may affect, [and is] likely to adversely  
5 affect” the NSO (a “MALAA” determination), FWS-1162-64, while the  
6 USFS maintained that a “may affect, not likely to adversely  
7 affect” determination—which would not require formal  
8 consultation—was appropriate for the Project, FS-18882-86; 50  
9 C.F.R. § 402.14. Due to this disagreement, the agencies elevated  
10 the Project to a Level 2 team for review. FWS-87. The USFS  
11 prepared and submitted a Final Biological Assessment (“BA”) for  
12 the FWS to review and requested formal consultation on July 5,  
13 2011. FS-18680, 18872; 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(c)(5). By the time  
14 the USFS sent over the BA, the agency had also concluded that an  
15 MALAA finding for the NSO was appropriate due to the Project’s  
16 potential impact on prey species. FS-18872.

17 While the Project was still under review, field examinations  
18 revealed a root disease infection that required Project  
19 modification. FS-18857. The USFS decided to apply borax to tree  
20 stumps in order to prevent the spread of the disease. FS-3580.  
21 The agency reopened scoping for the Project in February 2012 to  
22 address three substantive changes to the Project, including the  
23 use of borax and the change in the USFS’s determination that the  
24 Project warranted a MALAA finding. FS-3580. Plaintiff submitted  
25 its second set of scoping comments at the end of February, which  
26 “incorporate[d] by reference [its] original comments as well as  
27 [its] original Objection comments (attached).” FS-3545.

28 The FWS transmitted its Biological Opinion (“BiOp”) to the

1 USFS on March 15, 2012. FS-18680. The BiOp concludes that the  
2 Project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of  
3 the NSO rangewide or within the recovery unit. FS-18787. It  
4 based this conclusion on the fact that no NSO habitat loss was  
5 expected and habitat functionality would be maintained. FS-  
6 18788. The expected impacts—degradation of some habitat and  
7 harassment/mortality in two home ranges—were expected to be short  
8 term, returning back to normal within two to three years post-  
9 implementation. FS-18788. It also concluded that the Project is  
10 not likely to result in adverse modification of the NSO critical  
11 habitat, and that habitat degradation was not expected to impede  
12 the recovery function of critical habitat rangewide or within the  
13 province. FS-18788-89. An Incidental Take Statement (“ITS”)  
14 accompanied the BiOp. The ITS, under “Terms and Conditions,”  
15 imposed a Limited Operating Period (“LOP”) from February 1st to  
16 September 15th in certain units in accordance with recent,  
17 protocol-level survey results. FS-18792. This LOP supplemented  
18 the conservation measures already pleaded in the BA, which the  
19 USFS must implement. FS-18696. Additionally, the ITS imposes  
20 “Monitoring Requirements” that require the agency to document the  
21 progress of the action and its effects on the NSO to the FWS in  
22 the form of annual monitoring reports containing a minimum of the  
23 following information: “progress/status of the proposed project,  
24 amount and type of habitat removed or modified, northern spotted  
25 owl survey results, and any changes to project implementation not  
26 discussed in the biological assessment.” FS-18792-93.

27 The USFS sent out copies of the Draft Final EA and  
28 Appendices mid-June 2012 and opened up the second 30-day

1 Objection Period. FS-1365-1436. Plaintiff submitted additional  
2 objections. FS-1346, 1291. On August 29th and 30th the USFS  
3 published the Final Environmental Assessment and the Decision  
4 Notice. FS-10, 19. In its final form, the Project will treat  
5 approximately 6400 acres and will include fuel treatments through  
6 implementation of Strategically Placed Land Area Treatments  
7 across the landscape, timber harvest in matrix lands, and  
8 improvement of plantations, meadows, hardwood and late  
9 successional habitat. FS-21, 23. The Decision Notice concluded  
10 that the Project's actions will not have a significant effect on  
11 the quality of the human environment, thus the agency would not  
12 be preparing an environmental impact statement. FS-12. The  
13 Forest Supervisor decided to implement the proposed Project,  
14 which incorporates the terms and conditions of the ITS. FS-11.

15 On December 4, 2012, the FWS published a final, revised rule  
16 designating critical habitat for the NSO ("2012 Critical Habitat  
17 Rule"). FS-19091. Because the rule affected most of the  
18 Project, USFS issued a Supplemental Biological Assessment. The  
19 Supplemental BA concluded that the new finding with respect to  
20 NSO critical habitat is MALAA due to short-term adverse effects  
21 to NSO nesting/roosting and foraging habitat. FS-19089, 19139.  
22 The USFS reinitiated consultation with the FWS on that basis.  
23 FS-19089. In the resulting 2014 BiOp, the FWS concluded that the  
24 Project is not likely to jeopardize the NSO nor adversely modify  
25 or destroy its designated critical habitat. FS-18996.

26 The USFS reinitiated consultation yet again, in January  
27 2015, after surveyors discovered NSOs in a new location in the  
28 Project area. FS-19387. This led to the designation of two new

1 activity centers. FS-19348. The agency sent the FWS its Second  
2 Supplemental BA at the end of May 2015 and the FWS issued its  
3 BiOp, with the same jeopardy and adverse modification  
4 determination, on July 24, 2015. FS-19243-79. On November 30,  
5 2015, the USFS published a Supplemental Information Report,  
6 summarizing the agency's "analysis supporting [its] determination  
7 that there is no need for supplemental NEPA analysis arising from  
8 the new circumstances and information related to the Project."  
9 FS-1.

10 While consultation on the Project was ongoing, the FWS  
11 published the Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl  
12 ("2011 RRP"). FS-4230. "Recovery plans describe reasonable  
13 actions and criteria that are considered necessary to recover  
14 listed species." FS-4231. The 2011 RRP came out June 28, 2011—  
15 one day after USFS biologists signed off on the Project's BA—and  
16 replaced the 2008 version of the plan. FS-4231. The 2011 RRP is  
17 frequently referenced in agency documents and is central to some  
18 of Plaintiff's claims.

## 19 II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

20 Plaintiff filed its Complaint against the USFS and FWS over  
21 the Project on September 23, 2013, alleging violations of the  
22 National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), the Endangered  
23 Species Act ("ESA"), the National Forest Management Act ("NFMA"),  
24 and the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). ECF No. 1. The  
25 case was twice stayed as the USFS reinitiated consultation with  
26 the FWS at the end of 2013 and again in 2015. ECF Nos. 15 & 53.  
27 The second stay terminated with the completion of consultation in  
28 July 2015 and Plaintiff filed its Second Amended Complaint, the

1 operative complaint in this case, that October. ECF Nos. 57 &  
2 65. In February 2015, Trinity River Lumber Company  
3 ("Intervenor") moved to intervene as a defendant-intervenor in  
4 this case, which the Court allowed after the second stay lifted.  
5 ECF Nos. 28 & 63. Intervenor is a family owned business that  
6 purchased the Smokey Stewardship Project in order to harvest the  
7 Project trees and process the logs into lumber through its local  
8 mill. See Declaration of Dee Sanders, ECF No. 30. With the  
9 Court's leave, Plaintiff filed a Supplemental Complaint on July  
10 26, 2016, based on the Supplemental Information Report that  
11 issued after Plaintiff had filed the Second Amended Complaint.  
12 ECF Nos. 100, 101, & 102.

13 The parties filed their Motion and Cross-Motions for Summary  
14 Judgment in July and September of 2016, respectively. ECF Nos.  
15 103, 106, & 109. In support of its motion, Plaintiff submitted a  
16 Declaration by Tonja Chi, which Defendants moved to strike. ECF  
17 No. 103-4 & 107. Due to Plaintiff's prior representation that it  
18 would not request the Court to consider extra-record declarations  
19 in the case, the Court granted Defendants' motion to strike the  
20 declaration. ECF No. 118. Additionally, the Court granted  
21 Defendants' unopposed motion to strike paragraphs 11 and 12 from  
22 Denise Boggs' Declaration and paragraph 10 from Ellen Drell's  
23 Declaration. Id.

24 The Court held a hearing on the Motion and Cross-Motions for  
25 Summary Judgment on February 2, 2017. The Court took the matter  
26 under submission and ordered further briefing on the question of  
27 remedies. ECF No. 120.

28 ///

1 III. OPINION

2 A. Standard of Review

3 Because Plaintiff's claims arise under Acts that do not  
4 provide a separate standard for review, the claims are reviewed  
5 under the standards of the APA. See San Luis & Delta-Mendota  
6 Water Auth. v. Jewell, 747 F.3d 581, 601 (9th Cir. 2014). A  
7 court does not employ the usual summary judgment standard in this  
8 context because, rather than resolving facts, the court is to  
9 determine whether or not "the evidence in the administrative  
10 record permitted the agency to make the decision it did." Ctr.  
11 for Sierra Nevada Conservation v. U.S. Forest Service, 832 F.  
12 Supp. 2d 1138, 1148 (E.D. Cal. 2011). Thus, this Court will  
13 uphold an agency's decision unless it is arbitrary, capricious,  
14 an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.  
15 Jewell, 747 F.3d at 601; 5 U.S.C. § 706(2). "Although [the  
16 Court's] inquiry must be thorough, the standard of review is  
17 highly deferential." Id. (citations and quotation marks  
18 omitted).

19 B. Standing

20 Defendants and Intervenor do not challenge Plaintiff's  
21 standing to pursue its claims. Plaintiff submitted declarations  
22 from three of its members, including Executive Director Denise  
23 Boggs, in order to establish standing. Declaration of Denise  
24 Boggs ("Boggs Decl."), ECF No. 103-1; Declaration of Douglas  
25 Bevington ("Bevington Decl."), ECF No. 103-2; Declaration of  
26 Ellen Drell ("Drell Decl."), ECF No. 103-3. Each declarant  
27 states that they visit the relevant area of the Mendocino  
28 National Forest for recreational purposes, including looking for

1 NSOs. Boggs Decl. at ¶¶ 4-6, 9; Bevington Decl. at ¶¶ 2, 6, 7;  
2 Drell Decl. at ¶¶ 2, 3, 5. Each declarant has general and  
3 specific plans to visit the area in the future. Boggs Decl. at  
4 ¶ 8; Bevington Decl. at ¶ 2; Drell Decl. at ¶ 6. Each is  
5 concerned that the Project will harm the forest and the NSO and  
6 relies on Plaintiff to litigate those interests on their behalf.  
7 Boggs Decl., *passim*; Bevington Decl. at ¶¶ 5-8; Drell Decl. at  
8 ¶ 7-8. The Court finds these facts sufficient to give Plaintiff  
9 standing. See Conservation Cong. v. U. S. Forest Service, No.  
10 2:15-00249, 2016 WL 727272, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2016)  
11 (finding that Conservation Congress had standing); Cottonwood  
12 Envtl. Law Ctr. v. U.S. Forest Service, 789 F.3d 1075, 1079-80  
13 (9th Cir. 2015) (describing the standard).

14 C. NEPA Claims

15 The National Environmental Policy Act is our basic national  
16 charter for protection of the environment. 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1.  
17 NEPA “has twin aims. First, it places upon a federal agency the  
18 obligation to consider every significant aspect of the  
19 environmental impact of a proposed action. Second, it ensures  
20 that the agency will inform the public that it has indeed  
21 considered environmental concerns in its decisionmaking process.”  
22 Kern v. U.S. Bureau of Land Mgmt., 284 F.3d 1062, 1066 (9th Cir.  
23 2002) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). NEPA  
24 does not impose substantive environmental obligations; “[r]ather,  
25 it establishes ‘action-forcing’ procedures that require agencies  
26 to take a ‘hard look’ at environmental consequences.” Id.

27 Under NEPA, federal agencies must provide a detailed  
28 environmental impact statement (“EIS”) for every major federal

1 action significantly affecting the quality of the human  
2 environment. 42 U.S.C. § 4332; 40 C.F.R. § 1508.11. An agency  
3 contemplating such an action may first prepare an environmental  
4 assessment ("EA") in order to determine whether an EIS is  
5 necessary. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9; Blue Mountains Biodiversity  
6 Project v. Blackwood, 161 F.3d 1208, 1212 (9th Cir. 1998).  
7 Should an agency determine that an EIS is unwarranted, it will  
8 issue a Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact  
9 ("DN/FONSI") that provides "a convincing statement of reasons" to  
10 explain why the action will not have a significant effect on the  
11 human environment. See Save the Yaak Comm. v. Block, 840 F.2d  
12 714, 717 (9th Cir. 1988); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.13.

13 The Healthy Forest Restoration Act ("HFRA"), passed in 2003,  
14 modifies an agency's NEPA obligations for qualifying projects.  
15 The purposes of the HFRA include, *inter alia*, reducing wildfire  
16 risks, enhancing efforts to protect watersheds and address  
17 threats to forest and rangeland health, and protecting,  
18 restoring, and enhancing forest ecosystem components to promote  
19 the recovery of threatened and endangered species. 16 U.S.C.  
20 § 6501. An authorized hazardous fuel reduction project may be  
21 implemented under the HFRA on federal land if the land contains  
22 threatened or endangered species habitat where "natural fire  
23 regimes on that land are identified as being important for, or  
24 wildfire is identified as a threat to" a threatened species, the  
25 project will provide enhanced protection from catastrophic  
26 wildfire for the species or its habitat, and the project complies  
27 with any applicable guidelines specified in any management or  
28 recovery plan for the species. 16 U.S.C. § 6512(a). Except as

1 provided in the HFRA, authorized projects must still comply with  
2 NEPA. 16 U.S.C. § 6514. An EA or EIS is required for every such  
3 project. 16 U.S.C. § 6514. The HFRA expedites the  
4 administrative review process and limits the range of project  
5 alternatives that must be considered in detail. 16 U.S.C.  
6 §§ 6514(c), 6515; 36 C.F.R. §§ 218.1-218.16.

7 The USFS considers the Project an HFRA authorized hazardous  
8 fuels reduction project and Plaintiff does not challenge that  
9 designation in this litigation. The USFS explained that the  
10 Project qualifies under the HFRA because the Project is located  
11 in a Late Successional Reserve ("LSR") that provides habitat for  
12 the NSO, includes portions of NSO critical habitat, and is  
13 classified as Fire Regime Condition Class 3, which indicates  
14 severe departure from historic conditions and significant chance  
15 for the loss of species or habitats. FS-23.

16 Plaintiff argues that the USFS violated NEPA by: (1) failing  
17 to prepare an EIS; (2) failing to adequately assess cumulative  
18 impacts; (3) failing to evaluate alternatives; (4) failing to  
19 take a hard look at the Project's impacts; and (5) failing to  
20 prepare a supplemental EA or EIS. See Plaintiff's Motion for  
21 Summary Judgment ("P. MSJ"), ECF No. 103. The Court will  
22 consider each of these claims in turn, noting that several of  
23 Plaintiff's arguments apply to more than one claim.

24 1. Failure to Prepare an Environmental Impact  
25 Statement

26 "An EIS must be prepared if 'substantial questions are  
27 raised as to whether a project . . . may cause significant  
28 degradation of some human environmental factor.'" Blue Mountains

1 Biodiversity Project, 161 F.3d at 1212 (quoting Idaho Sporting  
2 Cong. v. Thomas, 137 F.3d 1146, 1149 (9th Cir. 1996)). Plaintiff  
3 may prevail on its claim that the USFS violated its statutory  
4 duty by raising these questions and is not required to show that  
5 the significant effects will in fact occur. Blue Mountains  
6 Biodiversity Project, 161 F.3d at 1212. An agency "cannot avoid  
7 preparing an EIS by making conclusory assertions that an activity  
8 will have only an insignificant impact on the environment."  
9 Ocean Advocates v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs, 402 F.3d 846, 864  
10 (9th Cir. 2004).

11 In order to determine whether an action "significantly"  
12 affects the environment an agency must consider the context and  
13 intensity of the project. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27. Context means  
14 "that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several  
15 contexts such as society as a whole, the affected region, the  
16 affected interests, and the locality." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(a).  
17 Intensity "refers to the severity of impact" and requires the  
18 responsible officials to consider ten separate factors in order  
19 to evaluate an action's intensity. 40 C.F.R. § 1058.27(b). The  
20 presence of even just "one of these factors may be sufficient to  
21 require an EIS in appropriate circumstances." Ocean Advocates,  
22 402 F.3d at 865 (citing Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v.  
23 Babbitt, 241 F.3d 722, 731 (9th Cir. 2001) *abrogated in part by*  
24 Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7 (2008)).

25 The USFS published its EA and DN/FONSI at the end of August  
26 2012. Plaintiff claims this decision was arbitrary and  
27 capricious because the Project implicates six of the ten

28 ///

1 intensity factors.<sup>1</sup> Thus, Plaintiff argues, an EIS was required.<sup>2</sup>

2 a. Context

3 The significance of a project “varies with the setting of  
4 the proposed action.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(a). Thus, “[c]ontext  
5 simply delimits the scope of the agency’s action, including the  
6 interests affected.” Babbitt, 241 F.3d at 731. “Both short- and  
7 long-term effects are relevant.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(a).

8 The Smokey Project is located in the Mendocino National  
9 Forest in Northern California. FS-21. The vast majority (about  
10 80%) of the Project will take place in the Buttermilk LSR, with  
11 the remainder occurring in matrix lands (12%), riparian reserves,  
12 and the Grindstone Inventoried Roadless area. FS-21-22.  
13 Portions of the Project will take place in the NSO’s designated  
14 critical habitat as determined by the 2012 Critical Habitat Rule.  
15 FS-4, 19101-2. The region’s characteristics are discussed in

---

16  
17 <sup>1</sup> These six factors as discussed as follows in Part III.C.1.b-g  
18 are: 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(3) unique characteristics of the  
19 geographic area; (4) the degree to which the effects on the  
20 quality of the human environment are likely to be highly  
21 controversial; (5) the degree to which the possible effects on  
22 the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or  
23 unknown risks; (7) whether the action is related to other actions  
24 with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant  
25 impacts; (9) the degree to which the action may adversely affect  
26 an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been  
27 determined to be critical; and (10) whether the action threatens  
28 a violation of Federal State, or local law or requirements  
imposed for the protection of the environment.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff occasionally cites to findings in the 2014 BiOp. At  
the time the DN/FONSI issued, USFS only had the 2012 BiOp. The  
Court will only consider what was in front of the agency at the  
time of decision. See Conservation Cong. v. Heywood, No. 2:11-  
cv-02250, 2015 WL 5255346, at 8 (E.D. Cal. Sep. 9, 2015) (“Review  
under the APA is to be based on the full administrative record  
that was before the agency at the time it made its decision.”)  
(citations and quotation marks omitted).

1 more detail below. Plaintiff does not challenge the Project on  
2 context grounds. See P. MSJ at 15.

3 b. Unique Characteristics of the Geographic  
4 Area Such as Proximity to Historic or  
5 Cultural Resources, Park Lands, Prime  
6 Farmlands, Wetlands, Wild and Scenic Rivers,  
7 or Ecologically Critical Areas

8 The parties substantially agree that the Buttermilk LSR is a  
9 unique and important region of the Mendocino National Forest,  
10 especially with respect to late successional habitat dependent  
11 species like the NSO. P. MSJ at 1; FS-42, 211, 5320, 5324. This  
12 consensus is not dispositive: "proximity of a project to a  
13 sensitive area does not per se warrant an EIS." Klamath-Siskiyou  
14 Wildlands Ctr. v. Grantham, 424 Fed. Appx. 635, 638 (9th Cir.  
15 2011). Plaintiff must also "explain how the project would have a  
16 'significant effect' on [the area]." Id. The Court thus  
17 considers the region's uniqueness in light of the remaining  
18 factors.

19 c. The Degree to Which the Effects On the  
20 Quality of the Human Environment Are Likely  
21 to Be Highly Controversial

22 A project is "controversial" in "cases where a substantial  
23 dispute exists as to the size, nature, or effect of the major  
24 federal action rather than to the existence of opposition to a  
25 use." Found. for N. Am. Wild Sheep v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., 681  
26 F.2d 1172, 1182 (9th Cir. 1982). The Ninth Circuit has found  
27 sufficient controversy where an agency "received numerous  
28 responses from conservationists, biologists, and other  
knowledgeable individuals [-including two California State  
Departments-] all highly critical of the EA and all disputing the  
EA's conclusion[.]" Id. In contrast, where a dispute is limited

1 to disagreement between qualified experts over what the data  
2 reveals, the Circuit has deferred to the agency. See Greenpeace  
3 Action v. Franklin, 14 F.3d 1324, 1335 (9th Cir. 1992) ("If this  
4 type of disagreement were all that was necessary to mandate an  
5 EIS, the environmental assessment process would be  
6 meaningless.").

7 Plaintiff contends that there is a substantial dispute as to  
8 the effect of the project on the continued existence of the NSO  
9 and as to the actual impacts of active management—to this degree—  
10 in NSO habitat. P. MSJ at 23; Plaintiff's Consolidated Reply  
11 ("P. Rep."), ECF No. 114, at 24-25. Plaintiff cites the  
12 scientific debate described in the 2011 RRP as evidence of the  
13 "ongoing debate" over these issues. Id.

14 The USFS addressed this controversy in the EA. FS-42-44.  
15 The EA notes several papers that support Plaintiff's position—  
16 which Plaintiff raised in comments to the Project—and  
17 acknowledges the disagreement in the scientific community. FS-  
18 43. The EA then explains that the USFS relied on publications  
19 and observational data more specific to the relevant area in  
20 developing the Project. Id. The EA also explains that the  
21 Project does not conflict with findings that burned forests may  
22 benefit the species because the Project aims to manage stands to  
23 reduce the risk of mortality rather than eliminate fire  
24 occurrence entirely. Id.

25 As Plaintiff points out, the RRP also acknowledges the  
26 disagreement in the scientific community on these issues. See FS-  
27 4287. The RRP discusses publications similar to those Plaintiff  
28 raised in its comments to the Project. It addresses the issue as

1 follows:

2 This debate focuses on uncertainty and seems to be one  
3 of degree rather than fundamental difference in long-  
4 term conservation goals. We would like to build on  
5 areas of agreement for spotted owl recovery, but we  
6 recognize that many of these recommendations are  
7 controversial due to political and socio-economic  
8 reasons. However, given the need for action in the  
9 face of uncertainty, we continue to recommend that land  
10 managers implement a program of landscape-scale,  
11 science-based adaptive restoration treatments in  
12 disturbance-prone forests[.]

13 FS-4287. In another section, the RRP recognizes that its  
14 recommendation to apply "active forest management" "may be  
15 controversial" due, in part, to the different risks, benefits,  
16 and predictability of treatment in different areas. FS-4277.

17 This evidence of some disagreement in the scientific  
18 community does not make this particular Project "highly  
19 controversial." The USFS explained why its conclusions differ  
20 from Plaintiff's position and the cited publications. Its  
21 explanation accords with the RRP's observation that the benefit  
22 of forest management will vary by forest area. See FS-4277. The  
23 USFS considered opposing viewpoints and chose to rely on the  
24 conclusions of its own experts; those conclusions are tailored to  
25 this specific Project. This cited disagreement does not trigger  
26 the "highly controversial" factor.

27 Plaintiff also argues that the disagreement between the USFS  
28 and FWS employees over the MALAA determination, documented in  
inter-agency and intra-agency emails, constitutes controversy.  
The Court does not agree that this early disagreement mandates an  
EIS. Plaintiff's argument centers on emails from 2010 and 2011  
and concerns a dispute as to whether a formal FWS consultation  
was necessary. See generally FWS-1-1161; P. MSJ at 23; P. Rep.

1 at 7-11. Despite that disagreement, the USFS moved forward with  
2 formal consultation and later agreed that with the FWS's  
3 determination. FWS-1111-14, 1285. Plaintiff does not point the  
4 Court to any evidence in the decision documents that indicates  
5 the agencies continued to feud over the Project's impacts. In  
6 fact, the USFS addressed the initial disagreement in the EA:

7 The context of determining the threshold of 'may  
8 affect, likely to adversely affect' is an individual  
9 animal; the intensity threshold is very low, such that  
10 effects as minor as changes in foraging patterns and  
with probabilities as low as 'not discountable' receive  
a MALAA call. It is not highly controversial to differ  
on such fine points.

11 FS-44. The agency also stated, several times, that it ultimately  
12 defers to the FWS on the determination. FS-44, FS-53. The early  
13 emails alone do not indicate that the Project in its final form  
14 is "highly controversial." See Friends of the Earth v. Hintz,  
15 800 F.2d 822, 834 (9th Cir. 1986) (finding that early comments  
16 indicating a contrary position did not render the final decision  
17 arbitrary and capricious) ("Certainly, the Corps' initial  
18 comments were preliminary and subject to change as understanding  
19 of permit issues expanded, the factual record developed, and the  
20 mitigation plan created.").

21 d. The Degree to Which the Possible Effects On  
22 the Human Environment Are Highly Uncertain  
or Involve Unique or Unknown Risks

23 "[T]he regulations do not anticipate the need for an EIS  
24 anytime there is some uncertainty, but only if the effects of the  
25 project are 'highly' uncertain." Envtl. Prot. Info. Ctr. v. U.S.  
26 Forest Service, 451 F.3d 1005, 1011 (9th Cir. 2006) ("EPIC").  
27 The use of the word "highly" means that information merely  
28 favorable to a plaintiff does not necessarily reach the

1 significance threshold. Native Ecosystems Council v. U.S. Forest  
2 Service, 428 F.3d 1233, 1240 (9th Cir. 2005). "Preparation of an  
3 EIS is mandated where uncertainty may be resolved by further  
4 collection of data, or where the collection of such data may  
5 prevent 'speculation on potential . . . effects.'" Id. (quoting  
6 Babbitt, 241 F.3d at 731-32).

7 Plaintiff directs the Court to FWS's acknowledgment—in its  
8 email communications and the 2011 RRP—"that there are significant  
9 scientific uncertainties both as to the impacts of wildfire on  
10 NSOs and as to the risks of forest treatments intended to reduce  
11 wildfire risk." P. MSJ at 23; P. Rep. at 22. As discussed in  
12 the previous section, the 2011 RRP acknowledges that the expert  
13 disagreement regarding the impact of wildfire and active forest  
14 management on NSOs centers on uncertainty. FS-4287 ("This debate  
15 focuses on uncertainty and seems to be one of degree rather than  
16 fundamental difference in long-term conservation goals."). The  
17 RRP also discusses the uncertainties associated with barred owls,  
18 FS-4252, climate change, FS-4265, decision-making in light of  
19 past management activities, Id., and the short- and long-term  
20 effects of ecosystem restoration, FS-4280. Additionally,  
21 Plaintiff argues, the RRP emphasizes an "adaptive management"  
22 approach to management decisions due to such uncertainties. P.  
23 Rep. at 23 (citing FS-4237, 4260, 4261, 4306).

24 Although these documents do indicate uncertainty with  
25 respect to NSO recovery efforts, Plaintiff does not tailor its  
26 argument to the context of the Project at issue. To an extent,  
27 the Court may infer from these generalities that aspects of the  
28 Project cross into uncertain territory. But the Court cannot

1 conclude, without more, the degree that this Project's possible  
2 effects on the human environment are highly uncertain. Plaintiff  
3 has not argued that the Project's forest management techniques  
4 are new, unique to the region, or experimental such that the  
5 results are unpredictable. Cf. Ore. Wild v. Bureau of Land  
6 Mgmt., No. 6:14-cv-0110, 2015 WL 1190131 (D. Ore. Mar. 14, 2015)  
7 (finding the effects of a pilot project to be "highly  
8 uncertain").

9 Plaintiff further points out that there is a self-inflicted  
10 dearth of information with respect to the effects of projects  
11 like this in the Mendocino National Forest. P. Rep. at 23-24; P.  
12 Rep. at 4, n.1; see supra "Factual Background" (describing  
13 "Monitoring Requirements"). The record reveals that the USFS had  
14 failed to satisfy its monitoring obligations for other projects  
15 prior to its approval of this one. Plaintiff raised the USFS's  
16 failure to monitor its past projects in its initial comments:  
17 "[W]e have significant objections to this type of vegetation  
18 management in LSR when the Mendocino NF has violated its  
19 monitoring reporting requirements to the FWS for NSO for the life  
20 of the LRMP [(Land and Resource Management Plan)]." FS-174. The  
21 USFS's response, attached to the final EA in Appendix Z: "The  
22 forest has not done the monitoring." Id. Plaintiff renewed its  
23 concern during the Objection Period:

24 Through a FOIA request the Conservation Congress has  
25 documented that the MNF [sic] has never submitted a  
26 monitoring report to the USFWS that is required under  
27 Enforceable Terms and Conditions found in Biological  
28 Opinions. By not submitting these mandatory reports  
during the life of the LRMP, 15 years, the MNF has  
allowed the Environmental Baseline for the NSO to  
become invalid. The MNF has not documented the amount  
of owl habitat that has been removed, degraded, or

1 downgraded not [sic] has it kept up to date its  
2 incidental take database. The Forest has also failed  
3 to ever conduct any emergency consultations with the  
USFWS after wildfires affected CHU/LSR.

4 FS-1561. The Reviewing Official responded: "The [MNF]  
5 acknowledges that the cited requirements have not been met, and  
6 is in the process of compiling information to satisfy monitoring  
7 requirements of past Biological Opinions for reporting to USDI-  
8 FWS and NOAA Fisheries." FS-1539. That response issued  
9 September 15, 2010. The EA does not address the lack of  
10 monitoring in its uncertainty analysis.

11 Although the Court is concerned by these admissions, it  
12 lacks the context it would need to evaluate the degree to which  
13 the deficiency makes the Project's impacts "highly uncertain."  
14 The Court cannot readily determine how this data would change the  
15 analysis supporting the Project. Despite the lack of monitoring,  
16 the BiOp contains over eighty pages of NSO related analysis,  
17 including the Status of the NSO, Environmental Baseline, Effects  
18 of the Proposed Action, Cumulative Effects, and Critical Habitat.  
19 FS-18699-787. Both the BA and the BiOp reference NSO numbers,  
20 distribution, and survey data. FS-214-215, 18730-33, 18741-42.  
21 Without more, the Court cannot find that the USFS's conclusion on  
22 this factor was arbitrary.

23 e. Whether the Action is Related to Other  
24 Actions With Individually Insignificant But  
Cumulatively Significant Impacts

25 "Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a  
26 cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance  
27 cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking  
28 it down into small component parts." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(9).

1 "The general rule under NEPA is that, in assessing cumulative  
2 effects, the agency must give a sufficiently detailed catalogue  
3 of past, present, and future projects, and provide adequate  
4 analysis about how these projects, and the differences between  
5 the projects, are thought to have impacted the environment."  
6 Cascadia Wildlands v. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 801 F.3d 1105,  
7 1111 (9th Cir. 2015). "Consideration of cumulative impacts  
8 requires some quantified or detailed information that results in  
9 a useful analysis, even when the agency is preparing an EA and  
10 not an EIS." Ctr. for Env'tl. Law & Policy v. U.S. Bureau of  
11 Reclamation, 655 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th Cir. 2011) (internal  
12 quotation marks and citations omitted). NEPA does not mandate  
13 that the effects be presented in a particular form; an agency has  
14 discretion in deciding how to organize and present information.  
15 See Mont. Wilderness Ass'n v. Connell, 725 F.3d 988, 1002 (9th  
16 Cir. 2013).

17 Plaintiff first challenges the scope of the EA's cumulative  
18 impacts analysis, arguing that the USFS "irrationally limited  
19 [the analysis to] the perimeter of the immediate project area and  
20 fail[ed] to account for the impacts of the Project together with  
21 other actions affecting the NSO in the critical Buttermilk LSR."  
22 P. MSJ at 21-22. It argues that because the USFS has recognized  
23 the critical importance of the Buttermilk LSR, it should have  
24 analyzed the cumulative effects of the Project at that scale. P.  
25 MSJ at 22.

26 Courts generally "defer to an agency's determination of the  
27 scope of its cumulative effects review" and deference is  
28 warranted in this case. See Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v.

1 Alexander, 303 F.3d 1059, 1071 (9th Cir. 2002) (upholding Forest  
2 Service's cumulative effects analysis that only considered the  
3 west side of the forest rather than the entire forest); see also  
4 Kleppe v. Sierra Club, 427 U.S. 390 (1976) ("[D]etermination of  
5 the extent and effect of [cumulative environmental impacts], and  
6 particularly identification of the geographic area within which  
7 they may occur, is a task assigned to the special competency of  
8 the appropriate agencies."). The BA—the document cited in the EA  
9 for the NSO cumulative effects analysis—analyzes the  
10 environmental baseline and cumulative effects at the scale of the  
11 "Action Area." This area includes "the proposed treatment units  
12 plus a 1.3 mile radius surrounding the unit boundaries." FS-188.  
13 The BA explains that this acreage is used to account for those  
14 species that are wide ranging, like the NSO. Id. The Action  
15 Area encompasses 35,023 acres while the area of the proposed  
16 treatment units amounts to 6,337. Id. This delimited area  
17 appears to account for the location and movement patterns of the  
18 NSOs, thus warranting the Court's deference on this issue.

19 Plaintiff further argues that the NSO analysis is inadequate  
20 because "private actions are nowhere considered in the EA or any  
21 other environmental documentation for the project." P. MSJ at  
22 22. Actually, private actions are briefly discussed in the  
23 "Summary of Cumulative Effects" section of the BA, which the EA  
24 references. FS-267; see also FS-45) ("Both private land and  
25 Forest Service are accounted for in this analysis."). The BA  
26 identifies overlapping parcels of private land and states their  
27 apparent use, including some "light to moderate selective  
28 harvesting." Id. As for smaller personal inholdings, it states

1 that future management is unknown though "it can be predicted  
2 that some may be harvested, used for recreation, developed, or  
3 burned through prescribed fire." Id. A few lines down the BA  
4 concludes: "Considering potential Federal and other management  
5 activities, the home ranges would continue to provide adequate  
6 habitat for reproducing pairs. Suitable habitat on private land  
7 was not considered as part of this analysis. Loss of habitat on  
8 private land would not affect the suitability of these home  
9 ranges." Id. This final sentence indicates that even if private  
10 landholders harvested their land, the NSO home ranges would  
11 remain intact. Plaintiff does not identify any particular  
12 private projects that the USFS should have accounted for and the  
13 Court cannot speculate that any such "reasonably foreseeable"  
14 actions were omitted.

15 Lastly, Plaintiff contends that the cumulative effects  
16 analysis is inadequate with respect to past projects. P. MSJ at  
17 22; P. Rep. at 22 (conceding that the USFS did provide a more  
18 nuanced discussion of concurrent and future projects). The Court  
19 finds that the USFS adequately addressed past actions. Under  
20 Ninth Circuit precedent, an agency "may satisfy NEPA by  
21 aggregating the cumulative effects of past projects into an  
22 environmental baseline, against which the incremental impact of a  
23 proposed project is measured." Cascadia Wildlands, 801 F.3d at  
24 1111. The BA first addresses past actions in the subsection on  
25 "Baseline Information." See FS-204-228. With respect to forest  
26 management, the BA provides a table of past timber sales with the  
27 year and the number of acres sold. FS-205. It then measures the  
28 footprint of what was harvested (4,468, 13% of the Action Area)

1 and identifies the subset of that footprint that remains in a  
2 plantation type condition (1,500 acres, 4% of the Action Area).  
3 Id. It concludes that about half of those remaining acres  
4 currently provide foraging quality habitat. Id. Several pages  
5 later, the BA turns to the NSO and discusses its present status  
6 and environmental baseline. FS-214-15. The BA is only one of  
7 multiple reports cited in the EA, each of which assess the  
8 cumulative effects of the project with respect to particular  
9 resources. See, e.g., Fuels Report, FS-539-56 (discussing  
10 "Existing Conditions" and "Actions (past, present, future)  
11 significant to cumulative effects"). Plaintiff has not  
12 identified any past projects or events that USFS failed to  
13 account for; thus, the Court has no reason not to defer to the  
14 agency on this issue as well.

15 f. The Degree to Which the Action May Adversely  
16 Affect An Endangered or Threatened Species or  
17 Its Habitat That Has Been Determined To Be  
Critical Under the Endangered Species Act of  
1973

18 "NEPA regulations direct the agency to consider the degree  
19 of adverse effect on a species [or critical habitat], not the  
20 impact on individuals of that species." EPIC, 451 F.3d at 1010.  
21 It is therefore not the case that any impact to a listed species  
22 requires an EIS. See id. at 1012. The USFS evaluates this  
23 significance factor based on "the capability of the affected area  
24 to support overall viability of affected endangered or threatened  
25 species." FS-50 (citing Wildlife Specialist Report, July 16,  
26 2010, and Methodology for MIS Analysis, 2009).

27 ///

28 ///

1 As described in the "Factual Background," above, the EA  
2 concludes that the Project's impacts to the NSO are not  
3 significant. FS-53. The EA cites each agency's conclusion that  
4 although there is potential for harm to individual NSOs, that  
5 potential is short term. Id. It cites the BiOp's conclusion  
6 that the Project will not jeopardize the continued existence of  
7 the species at either the range-wide or the recovery unit scale,  
8 as well as the favorable conclusions in the BA and Wildlife  
9 Specialist Report. Id. The USFS determined: "Based on the small  
10 number of owls impacted, the short-term nature of the impacts,  
11 the undiminished functionality of all affected suitable habitat,  
12 and the continued ability of the area to support viability, the  
13 impacts to NSO are not significant." Id.

14 Plaintiff argues that the USFS's conclusion is untenable  
15 given the MALAA determination and FWS's findings throughout the  
16 record that the project would significantly impact NSOs. P. MSJ  
17 at 16-17. Plaintiff points out that the BiOp uses the term  
18 "significant" in multiple places. See, e.g., FS-18757  
19 ("Commercial thinning, fuels treatments, and habitat enhancement  
20 treatments are expected to result in significant effects to [NSO]  
21 breeding, feeding, and/or sheltering . . .), 18766 ("Smoke  
22 disturbance and habitat manipulation are expected to cause  
23 significant impairment of breeding, feeding, and sheltering of  
24 [NSOs] at this activity center during years 3, 4, and 5").  
25 Defendants argue that significance is a term of art in the NEPA  
26 context and it is the USFS's determination, not the FWS's use of  
27 the term, that dictates whether an EIS is required. Federal  
28 Defendants Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment ("D. Cr. Mot.") at

1 17.

2 Although the Project will have some impact on the NSOs in  
3 the Project area, the Court defers to the USFS's finding that the  
4 impact is not significant. The Court finds the Ninth Circuit's  
5 analysis in EPIC instructive. In that case, the plaintiff argued  
6 that an EIS should have been prepared because the project at  
7 issue was "likely to affect the NSO and its critical habitat  
8 significantly." EPIC, 451 F.3d at 1010. The FWS's BiOp reported  
9 that "'three nest sites could be destroyed' and that the logging  
10 [would] remove 'most, if not all, of the small amount of existing  
11 nesting habitat' within the critical habitat units." Id. Of the  
12 578 acres to be logged in the Klamath National Forest, 125 acres  
13 had been designated critical habitat. Id. Fourteen acres of  
14 nesting habitat was set to be removed, fifty-one acres of high  
15 quality nesting habitat would be degraded to moderate quality,  
16 and the remaining sixty acres—only suitable for dispersal—would  
17 maintain its dispersal function post-harvest. Id. Despite  
18 these certain and potential losses, the EPIC court deferred to  
19 the agency. It reasoned as follows:

20 These statements, however, must be read in context. For  
21 example, although the logging will remove existing  
22 nesting habitat from two critical habitat units, this  
23 amounts to a total of only fourteen acres. Similarly,  
24 the Project does not authorize the destruction of any  
25 existing nest sites, and surveys and seasonal  
26 restrictions operate to protect potentially occupied  
27 nest sites. The projected take of three nests or pairs  
28 of owls is based on extrapolations from nesting data,  
and FWS determined that this level of anticipated take  
was permissible under the ESA.

26 EPIC, 451 F.3d at 1010. In conclusion, the Ninth Circuit held  
27 "[i]t was not arbitrary and capricious for USFS to determine that  
28 although there will be some effect on individual pairs, this will

1 not cause a significant adverse effect on the species and require  
2 an EIS." Id. at 1011.

3 Although the project in EPIC was much smaller than the  
4 Project in this case, the proposals have similar projected  
5 impacts. This Project is expected to degrade habitat in two  
6 activity centers, resulting in significant effects for the owls  
7 in those centers; "take in the form of harm of juvenile [NSOs]  
8 and harassment of adult [NSOs]" is expected. FS-18789-90.  
9 Implementation of the LOP is expected to decrease the risk of  
10 harm to young in one of those centers. FS-18792. No loss of NSO  
11 habitat is expected and habitat function of the treated areas  
12 will be maintained (minus one linear unit for a temporary road).  
13 FS-18788. Habitat degradation is expected to be short-term,  
14 returning to normal after two to three years. FS-52, 18788.  
15 Unlike the EPIC project, no NSO habitat will be removed and no  
16 destruction of nest sites is anticipated. Thus, following the  
17 EPIC court's directive that significant effects to individual  
18 owls does not necessarily imply significant effects to the  
19 species, this Court finds that the USFS's "effects" conclusion  
20 was not arbitrary and capricious.

21 Plaintiff's additional arguments on this question are  
22 unavailing. Plaintiff argues that the USFS improperly relied on  
23 the FWS's "no jeopardy" determination in order to justify its  
24 conclusion regarding significance. P. MSJ at 19. This  
25 characterization of the agency's determination is inaccurate; the  
26 USFS refers to the Biological Assessment, Biological Opinion, and  
27 Wildlife Specialist Report Plaintiff in support of its  
28 determination. FS-53. It is entirely proper for the USFS to

1 consider the FWS's findings, along with the findings in these  
2 other documents, in reaching its conclusion. See EPIC, 451 F.3d  
3 at 1012 ("Clearly, NEPA and the ESA involve different standards,  
4 but this does not require the USFS to disregard the findings made  
5 by FWS in connection with formal consultation mandated by the  
6 ESA."). Finally, Plaintiff argues that the FWS's findings should  
7 not inform the USFS's conclusion because those findings relate to  
8 the range-wide and recovery unit scale impacts, rather than the  
9 Buttermilk LSR. P. MSJ at 19. As already discussed, NEPA  
10 requires the USFS to consider the degree of adverse effect on a  
11 species, not individuals. EPIC, 451 F.3d at 1010. Plaintiff  
12 fails to explain how a range-wide or recovery unit-scale analysis  
13 would impede the USFS in fulfilling its obligation.

14 g. Whether the Action Threatens a Violation of  
15 Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements  
16 Imposed For the Protection of the Environment

17 Plaintiff claims that because the Project violates the NFMA,  
18 the USFS is required to prepare an EIS. Plaintiff argues that  
19 the DN/FONSI's claim that the project is consistent with the  
20 Mendocino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan  
21 ("LRMP" or "Forest Plan") is contrary to FWS's express finding  
22 that the Project is inconsistent with portions of Recovery Action  
23 10 of the RRP. P. MSJ at 20 (citing FS-18983). The Court will  
24 fully address Plaintiff's claims with respect to the National  
25 Forest Management Act and 2011 Revised Recovery Plan in Part  
26 III.E, below. The Court concludes that the Project does not  
27 violate the NFMA.

28 ///

///

1 h. Conclusion

2 None of the issues Plaintiff raises—either separately or  
3 taken together—mandates preparation of an EIS. The Court finds  
4 for the Defendants on this claim.

5 2. Failure to Analyze Cumulative Impacts

6 Plaintiff asserts the failure to evaluate cumulative impacts  
7 of the proposed action as a separate NEPA cause of action.  
8 Compl. at 26. In its briefs, Plaintiff’s only arguments with  
9 respect to cumulative effects are contained under the cumulative  
10 effects intensity factor, addressed at Part III.C.1.e, supra.  
11 See P. MSJ at 20. As the Court concluded above, the USFS  
12 addressed the cumulative effects in the EA and the underlying  
13 reports. The Court rules in favor of the Defendants on this  
14 claim.

15 3. Failure to Develop Alternatives

16 Plaintiff argues that the USFS’s alternatives analysis was  
17 inadequate because the Project’s stated purpose is arbitrary and  
18 because the USFS failed to consider a proposed, reasonable  
19 alternative. The Court agrees that the alternatives analysis is  
20 inadequate.

21 a. Purpose and Need of the Project

22 The purpose and need of a project defines the scope of the  
23 alternatives analysis and an agency need only evaluate  
24 alternatives that are reasonably related to the project’s  
25 purposes. League of Wilderness Defenders-Blue Mountains  
26 Biodiversity Project v. U.S. Forest Service, 689 F.3d 1060, 1069  
27 (9th Cir. 2012). Courts afford agencies “considerable discretion  
28 to define the purpose and need of a project.” Id. (citations and

1 quotation marks omitted). However, because "the stated goal of a  
2 project necessarily dictates the range of reasonable alternatives  
3 [,] [] an agency cannot define its objectives in unreasonably  
4 narrow terms." City of Carmel-By-The-Sea v. U.S. Dep't of  
5 Transp., 123 F.3d 1142, 1155 (9th Cir. 1997).

6 The Project's purpose and need, as articulated in the EA, is  
7 the following:

8 The purpose of [the Project] is primarily to contribute  
9 to achieving wildlife habitat, fire management and  
10 secondarily to timber production goals established by  
11 the MHF Forest Plan. There is also a need to comply  
12 with applicable management direction of the Forest  
Plan, Forest Service Policy regulations and laws. Thus  
the proposal includes design features and requirements  
to ensure environmental compliance in addition to the  
activities that would achieve the Forest Plan goals.

13 FS-23. Plaintiff contends that this purpose is arbitrary because  
14 it conflicts with the 2011 RRP. P. MSJ at 12. Plaintiff argues  
15 that this purpose "ineluctably led the USFS to consider only a  
16 single irrational action alternative for the Project." Id.

17 The Project's purpose does not conflict with the RRP as  
18 Plaintiff claims. The RRP repeatedly states that it support  
19 forest management practices that aim to restore more natural  
20 vegetation patterns and fire regimes, including management in  
21 certain areas to reduce fire severity. See, e.g., FS-4298-99.  
22 The above quoted purpose does not contradict this advice. The  
23 term "fire management" is broad and may be understood to  
24 encompass the type of management the RRP favors. Furthermore,  
25 Plaintiff's own proposed alternatives, described below, belie the  
26 fact that the Project's purpose was not so narrowly drawn as to  
27 preclude consideration of other alternatives.

28 ///

1                   b.    Alternatives Analysis

2           Alternatives analysis is the heart of the environmental  
3 impact statement. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. The analysis "should  
4 present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the  
5 alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the  
6 issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by  
7 the decisionmaker and the public." Id.

8           Under NEPA, "[a]gencies are required to consider  
9 alternatives in both EISs and EAs and must give full and  
10 meaningful consideration to all reasonable alternatives." Te-  
11 Moak Tribe of West. Shoshone of Nev. v. U.S. Dep't of Interior,  
12 608 F.3d 592, 601-02 (9th Cir. 2010). "The existence of a viable  
13 but unexamined alternative renders an environmental impact  
14 statement inadequate." Morongo Band of Mission Indians v.  
15 F.A.A., 161 F.3d 569, 575 (9th Cir. 1998) (internal quotation  
16 marks and citation omitted) (applying this rule in the EA  
17 context). Projects authorized under the HFRA—like this one—need  
18 only consider three alternatives: the proposed agency action; the  
19 alternative of no action; and an additional action alternative,  
20 if the additional alternative—(i) is proposed during scoping or  
21 the collaborative process under subsection (f); and (ii) meets  
22 the purpose and need of the project, in accordance with  
23 regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality.  
24 16 U.S.C. § 6514(c).

25           The parties agree that under the HFRA, the USFS is required  
26 to consider one additional action alternative provided that the  
27 above conditions are met. The parties dispute whether those  
28 conditions were met in this instance. Plaintiff argues that it

1 proposed a viable action alternative that the USFS failed to  
2 consider. P. MSJ at 13; P. Rep. at 16. Specifically, Plaintiff  
3 contends that the following sentence, from its First Objection,  
4 raised an alternative that should have been considered: "To meet  
5 the intent of the LRMP, prescriptions should be designed to only  
6 maximize volume over other resources in the suitable timber base,  
7 not LSR. This is despite the reality that more limited thinning  
8 from below prescriptions with quantitative diameter limits (e.g.  
9 no big trees over 18" DBH will be cut in LSR) were a viable  
10 option that would meet all HFRA objectives, while also being  
11 consistent with LSR duties." FS-1580. The USFS did not consider  
12 an 18" DBH diameter cap.

13 Intervenor asserts that the USFS did not need to consider  
14 Plaintiff's diameter cap recommendation because the alternative  
15 was not raised during the first scoping period. Defendant-  
16 Intervenor's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment ("I. Cr. Mot."),  
17 ECF No. 109, at 9-10; Defendant-Intervenor's Reply ("I. Rep."),  
18 ECF No. 115, at 7. This argument is not persuasive. The HFRA  
19 requires an agency to consider an action alternative raised  
20 during scoping or the collaborative process under subsection (f).  
21 16 U.S.C. § 6514(c)(1)(C)(i). Subsection (f) prescribes "Public  
22 Collaboration" consistent with the "Implementation Plan," that  
23 encourages meaningful public participation during preparation of  
24 authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects. 16 U.S.C.  
25 § 6514(f). What constitutes the "collaborative process" is not  
26 clear; it does not appear that another court has had an  
27 opportunity to delimit the phrase. However, under basic  
28 principles of statutory interpretation, the Court may infer that

1 the "collaborative process" means something beyond "scoping" or  
2 the addition would be superfluous. See TRW Inc. v. Andrews, 534  
3 U.S. 19, 31 (2001) ("It is a cardinal principle of statutory  
4 construction that a statute ought, upon the whole, to be  
5 construed that, if it can be prevented, no clause, sentence, or  
6 word shall be superfluous, void, or insignificant."). Based on  
7 the Plaintiff's active participation throughout the iterations of  
8 the Project—as described in the "Factual Background"—the Court  
9 concludes that Plaintiff's suggestions were made during the  
10 collaborative process.

11 Defendants focus their argument on Plaintiff's form rather  
12 than timing. They argue that Plaintiff did not suggest an 18"  
13 DBH cap "outright" but merely did so "in passing" such that it  
14 failed to actually suggest an alternative that the USFS was  
15 required to consider. D. Cr. Mot. at 15-16; Federal Defendant's  
16 Reply ("D. Rep."), ECF No. 117, at 4.

17 This argument is also unpersuasive. The USFS nominally  
18 considered a diameter cap alternative in the EA. Under  
19 "Alternatives not Considered in Detail," the USFS lists "Using a  
20 diameter limit, removing no trees over 10" DBH" as an  
21 "alternative [ ] suggested by comments received during both  
22 scoping comment periods." FS-36-37. It then states that this  
23 cap would not meet the purpose and need of the project. Id.  
24 Plaintiff calls this "10" diameter cap" a "strawman alternative."  
25 P. MSJ at 13. After comparing the "Alternatives Analysis" in the  
26 EA to the comments and objections in the Administrative Record,  
27 the Court agrees. This Court's review of Appendix Z (Scoping  
28 Summary and Issue Identification), Supplemental Appendix Z

1 (Smokey EA Supplement, Scoping Summary and Issue Identification),  
2 and the scoping documents included in the Administrative Record  
3 (FS-3240-3691) does not turn up any comments specifically  
4 suggesting a 10" diameter cap.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, there were multiple  
5 comments and objections suggesting a diameter cap for large trees  
6 and/or expressing concern over the cutting of larger trees. See,  
7 e.g.:

- 8 • FS-3629 ("The HFRA also has very strong direction  
9 regarding the maintenance of old growth and 'Large'  
10 diameter trees." - Conservation Congress ("CC"), 1st  
11 Scoping);
- 12 • FS-3629 ("There is not information regarding size  
13 classes or age class for either management area [(LSR  
14 or Matrix)] and this information needs to be  
15 disclosed." - CC, 1st Scoping);
- 16 • FS-3636 ("These concerns would be greatly reduced if  
17 you would adopt a maximum DBH size such as 24" for the  
18 trees that can be cut, especially in the LSR." -  
19 California Wilderness Center, 1st Scoping);
- 20 • FWS-61 ("Also is there a radius around the hardwoods  
21 that would be followed? Would it include removal of  
22 larger trees (24"+ dbh)?" - FWS, 1st Scoping);
- 23 • FWS-1162 ("There may be areas where 20-24" trees could  
24 be harvested without adverse effects, but those would  
25 be on a site specific basis depending on stand

---

26 <sup>3</sup> At the hearing, Defense counsel raised the possibility that  
27 this suggestion was made at a meeting between Conservation  
28 Congress and USFS representatives, but conceded that it was not  
documented in the record.

1 characteristics." - FWS, Rationale for [MALAA]  
2 Determination);<sup>4</sup>

- 3 • FS-1568 ("The HFRA was passed with significant duties  
4 to not cut larger diameter, big, or old growth trees  
5 whenever feasible. Meeting that duty was feasible in  
6 the Smokey Project area. However the Smokey proposed  
7 action was designed to include logging various big,  
8 large diameter, and old growth trees and forests in a  
9 manner that violates the new legislative standard." -  
10 CC, 1st Objection);
- 11 • FS-1569 ("The removal of large diameter trees is not  
12 necessary in order to attain the objectives of this  
13 HFRA project. Furthermore, the controversy over large  
14 trees has been expressed continually from multiple  
15 organizations and local residents throughout the past  
16 nearly two years of meetings and comments." - CC, 1st  
17 Objection);
- 18 • FS-1580 ("To meet the intent of the LRMP, prescriptions  
19 should be designed to only maximize volume over other  
20 resources in the suitable timber base, not LSR. This  
21 is despite the reality that more limited thinning from  
22 below prescriptions with quantitative diameter limits  
23 (e.g. no big trees over 18" DBH will be cut in LSR)  
24 were a viable option that would meet all HFRA  
25 objectives, while also being consistent with LSR

---

26  
27 <sup>4</sup> The Court agrees with Defendants that the FWS did not propose a  
28 20" diameter cap as Plaintiff suggests. The quoted statement  
does, however, add weight to Plaintiff's point more generally.

1 duties." - CC, 1st Objection);

- 2 • FS-3546 ("Yet a secondary purpose of the project is to  
3 achieve timber production goals established in the  
4 Forest Plan. It's clear the secondary purpose is  
5 actually the first, since almost 18% of the timber cut  
6 will be 24" DBH or greater." - CC, 2nd Scoping);
- 7 • FS-3547 ("The Supplemental BA information included a  
8 Cruise Data Sheet documenting the DBH of trees to be  
9 cut. According to this chart, 36.2% of the trees  
10 logged in Smokey will be 20" DBH or GREATER - up to 43"  
11 DBH. These trees in critical habitat should not be  
12 logged for any reason[.]" - CC, 2nd Scoping);
- 13 • FS-3547 ("We also note from our FOIA responsive records  
14 that the FWS requested diameter limits repeatedly for  
15 this project yet their requests were also ignored by  
16 the NMF . . . . [In phone calls, the DOI/FWS has]  
17 stated that trees over 24" DBH should not be logged in  
18 owl critical habitat. . . . The FS has never  
19 articulated a rationale for not providing diameter  
20 limits for timber projects in owl habitat despite  
21 repeated requests to do so. We surmise it is because  
22 it is proposing to log large diameter trees that should  
23 not be logged." - CC, 2nd Scoping);
- 24 • FS-3547 ("The NWFP, the Recovery Plan, and numerous  
25 scientific papers all use diameter limits regarding  
26 tree retention in owl habitat. The fact the Mendocino  
27 steadfastly refuses to adopt diameter limits makes all  
28 projects in owl habitat suspect." - CC, 2nd Scoping);

- 1 • FS-3552 ("The Forest states that 'tree diameters in  
2 Smokey would be much larger, averaging 22" dbh and  
3 higher.' However, it fails to mention what the average  
4 diameter could be if it implemented a restriction on  
5 the size of trees being cut (i.e. no trees harvested  
6 over 24" dbh)." - CC, 2nd Scoping);
- 7 • FS-3553 ("The removal of small diameter trees would  
8 improve the foraging habitat for Northern spotted owls.  
9 However, this project also proposed to remove large  
10 diameter trees. . . . [R]emoving the forest (or  
11 critical habitat components - large trees) is not  
12 compatible with the stated purpose of this project." -  
13 CC, 2nd Scoping).

14 The record is full of suggestions and concerns regarding  
15 diameter caps (18", 20", and 24") and retention of larger trees,  
16 and Defendants fail to explain why none of these triggered the  
17 HFRA requirement to prepare a single additional alternative.  
18 Although Plaintiff did not explicitly frame its suggestion as a  
19 "proposed alternative," the sampling of comments above show that  
20 Plaintiff did more than just mention a diameter cap "in passing."  
21 As Defendants note, "[p]ersons challenging an agency's compliance  
22 with NEPA must structure their participation so that it alerts  
23 the agency to the parties' position and contentions." D. Rep. at  
24 4-5 (quoting Dep't of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen, 541 U.S. 752, 764  
25 (2004)). Plaintiff—and others—did so here and the Court finds  
26 that the USFS's decision not to consider, or even acknowledge, an  
27 alternative with a larger diameter cap was arbitrary and  
28 capricious.

1           4.    Failure To Take a "Hard Look" At Project's  
2                    Impacts

3           Plaintiff argues that even if the Project does not require  
4 an EIS, the USFS still failed to take a hard look at the impacts  
5 of the Project in violation of NEPA.   See Neighbors of Cuddy  
6 Mountain v. Alexander, 303 F.3d 1059 (9th Cir. 2002).  On this  
7 question, the Court primarily looks to the USFS's analysis in the  
8 EA, the underlying reports referenced therein, and the  
9 Supplemental Information Report, keeping in mind NEPA's twin aims  
10 of fostering better decision making and informing public  
11 participation for actions that affect the environment.   See Ore.  
12 Natural Res. Council Action v. U.S. Forest Service, 293 F. Supp.  
13 2d 1200, 1204 (D. Ore. 2003).

14           An EA is a "concise public document" that briefly provides  
15 sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to  
16 prepare an EIS; it aids an agency's compliance with NEPA when no  
17 EIS is necessary and facilitates EIS preparation when one is  
18 necessary.  40 C.F.R. § 1508.9(a).  It must include "brief  
19 discussions of the need for the proposal, of alternatives as  
20 required by [NEPA], of the environmental impacts of the proposed  
21 action and alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons  
22 consulted."  40 C.F.R. § 1508.9(b).  NEPA's requirements ensure  
23 "that the agency, in reaching its decision, will have available,  
24 and will carefully consider detailed information concerning  
25 significant environmental impacts; it also guarantees that the  
26 relevant information will be made available to the larger  
27 audience that may also play a role in both the decisionmaking  
28 process and the implementation of that decision."  Ore. Natural

1 Res. Council Action, 293 F. Supp. 2d at 1204-05 (citations and  
2 quotation marks omitted). The Court is thus charged with  
3 reviewing the adequacy of the agency's analysis, while keeping in  
4 mind that it is not the Court's role to order the agency to  
5 explain every possible scientific uncertainty. See The Lands  
6 Council v. McNair, 537 F.3d 981, 986 (9th Cir. 2008).

7 As previously explained, the USFS's failure to consider or  
8 address the alternatives raised during public collaboration  
9 renders the EA inadequate. This deficiency is one indication  
10 that the agency failed to take a hard look at the Project's  
11 impacts. Plaintiff raises several other concerns that further  
12 support such a finding.

13 The Limited Operating Period is stated inconsistently  
14 throughout the record, making it difficult for Plaintiff, the  
15 Court, the public, and perhaps even the agency to know exactly  
16 how the LOP operates. The DN/FONSI states that the Project  
17 incorporates the LOP required by the 2012 BiOp's ITS, but  
18 Appendix A of the EA states the LOP in different terms. Compare  
19 FS-18792 ("Implement a limited operating period . . . in the  
20 units containing suitable nesting/roosting or foraging habitat.  
21 . . . If current protocol-level survey information is not  
22 current/available, a limited operating period [will be  
23 implemented within] . . . any unsurveyed nesting/roosting  
24 habitat." - 2012 BiOp) with FS-77 ("A limited operating period  
25 (LOP) for northern spotted owls would be applied to all units  
26 from February 1 to September 15 unless current protocol-level  
27 surveys indicate that they are unnecessary." - EA, Appendix A).  
28 The LOP again changes in the Supplemental BiOps (2014 and 2015),

1 though the USFS states it will adhere to the LOP as written in  
2 the 2012 ITS. In April of last year, the USFS sent Trinity a  
3 letter listing the units where an LOP from February 1st to  
4 September 15th would apply, an LOP from February 1st to July 10th  
5 would apply, and where no LOP would apply in the event that no  
6 protocol surveys are not conducted in a given year. ECF No. 86-  
7 1. This advice conflicts with the LOP as written in Appendix A  
8 of the EA. Intervenor offers an explanation of how the list is  
9 consistent with the LOP as written in the 2012 BiOp's ITS, but  
10 that explanation is not readily discernable from the EA or the  
11 accompanying documents. See I. Cr. Mot. at 19. Even counsel's  
12 explanation at the hearing relied on data from several different  
13 sources; a clear and consolidated explanation is found nowhere in  
14 the record or documents made available to the public. The  
15 confusion makes it difficult to discern the Project's impacts in  
16 the circumstance that current protocol level surveys are  
17 unavailable. It also makes it difficult for the public to play a  
18 role in the decision-making process or project implementation,  
19 running counter to one of NEPA's principal aims.

20 As noted previously, this Court is concerned by the fact  
21 that the USFS has admittedly failed to do the monitoring required  
22 for other projects. Although the Court declines to find that  
23 this deficiency mandates preparation of an EIS, the fact that the  
24 agency fails to address this issue in its decision documents  
25 raises suspicion. While the concern is noted in Appendix Z of  
26 the EA, the agency merely admits that monitoring has not occurred  
27 and offers no explanation of why, no description of how the issue  
28 will be ameliorated, and no rationale for why this deficiency

1 does not render the Project's impacts "uncertain." It does not  
2 appear the agency took a hard look at this question.

3 Plaintiff raises a number of other issues with the EA, most  
4 of which lack merit because the concerns are addressed in the  
5 Appendices and cited underlying reports. Of those concerns, the  
6 Court agrees that the EA contains varying statistics regarding  
7 the number of acres to be treated; while a thorough read of the  
8 decision documents clarifies these differences, the EA's lack of  
9 precision does make the document confusing. Although this issue  
10 would not likely, by itself, warrant a finding against the USFS,  
11 the agency would be wise to be more careful in its revision.

12 Given the failure to address reasonable alternatives, the  
13 inconsistent LOPs, and the failure to address past monitoring  
14 practices, the Court finds that the USFS did not conform to NEPA  
15 and take the requisite hard look at the Project.

16 5. Failure to Prepare a Supplemental EA or EIS

17 Although Supplemental Information Reports are not mentioned  
18 in NEPA or its regulations, courts recognize a "limited role" for  
19 them in environmental evaluation procedures. Idaho Sporting  
20 Congress Inc. v. Alexander, 222 F.3d 562, 566 (9th Cir. 2000).

21 Courts have upheld their use in an agency's determination of  
22 whether new information or changed circumstances require the  
23 preparation of a supplemental EA or EIS. Id. "If the  
24 environmental impacts resulting from the design change are  
25 significant or uncertain, as compared with the original design's  
26 impacts, a supplemental EA is required." Id.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Plaintiff primarily argues that the SIR is arbitrary and  
2 capricious because it fails to address the USFS's "design change"  
3 in the LOP. P. MSJ at 24. The argument is based on the April 1,  
4 2016 letter from the USFS to Trinity. P. MSJ at 24; P. Rep. at  
5 25; ECF No. 86-1. The agency prepared the SIR in 2015 and thus  
6 this letter was not before it. The Court acknowledges that the  
7 LOP determinations and the 2016 letter are confusing. This  
8 concern is best addressed in the "hard look" analysis, above.

9 Plaintiff also argues that the USFS "piggybacks" on the  
10 FWS's no-jeopardy conclusion in the 2014 BiOp and thus failed to  
11 take a "hard look" at the impacts of the change in the NSO's  
12 critical habitat designation. P. MSJ at 24. This is not the  
13 case. The SIR relies on the BiOp in part, but does so broadly  
14 and in addition the 2014 Supplemental BA. The SIR cites to the  
15 lengthy analysis in both documents in support of its conclusion  
16 that "[t]he Smokey Project will have long term beneficial effects  
17 on [NSO] habitat and any adverse impacts to designated critical  
18 habitat would be minor and temporary." FS-3-5. Plaintiff does  
19 not claim the Supplemental BA was inadequate. Plaintiff points  
20 out that the USFS did not mention the declining NSO population in  
21 the SIR, but Plaintiff does not explain how this renders the  
22 determination inadequate.

23 In sum, the Court finds that the USFS's decision not to  
24 prepare a Supplemental EA or EIS was not arbitrary and capricious  
25 and finds for Defendants on this claim.

26 D. ESA Claims

27 The ESA requires any federal agency seeking to implement a  
28 project that could adversely affect the habitat of an endangered

1 or threatened species to go through a formal consultation process  
2 with the FWS. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2); Gifford Pinchot Task Force  
3 v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 378 F.3d 1059, 1063 (9th Cir.  
4 2004). Before the consultation begins, the agency must submit a  
5 “biological assessment for the purpose of identifying any  
6 endangered species or threatened species which is likely to be  
7 affected” by the agency’s proposed action. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(c).  
8 Prior to and during the consultation process, the federal agency  
9 and the FWS must use the “best scientific and commercial data  
10 available.” 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)-(c). At the end of the formal  
11 consultation process, the FWS must issue a Biological Opinion  
12 (“BiOp”). 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(3)(A). A BiOp is a “written  
13 statement setting forth the Secretary’s opinion, and a summary of  
14 the information on which the opinion is based, detailing how the  
15 agency action affects the species or its critical habitat.” Id.  
16 If the FWS believes that the project will jeopardize a listed  
17 species or adversely modify the species’ habitat, “the Secretary  
18 shall suggest those reasonable and prudent alternatives which he  
19 believes would not violate subsection (a)(2) and can be taken by  
20 the Federal agency or applicant in implementing the agency  
21 action.” Id. The biological opinion is considered a final  
22 agency action and is subject to judicial review. Nat’l Wildlife  
23 Fed’n v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv., 524 F.3d 917, 925 (9th  
24 Cir. 2007).

25 The ESA also prohibits any federal agency from “taking” a  
26 listed species. 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1). To “take” means to  
27 harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or  
28 collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” 16 U.S.C.

1 § 1532 (19). If the federal action will result in the taking of  
2 an endangered or threatened species incidental to the agency  
3 action, the action may still go forward if the FWS approves of it  
4 through an Incidental Take Statement ("ITS"). 16 U.S.C. § 1536  
5 (b)(4); Arizona Cattle Growers' Ass'n v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife,  
6 273 F.3d 1229, 1239 (9th Cir. 2001). The ITS specifies the  
7 impact of the incidental take on the species, the measures  
8 necessary or appropriate to minimize impact, and the terms and  
9 conditions that must be complied with by the applicant agency to  
10 implement those measures. Id. If an agency modifies the action  
11 it intends to take or does not comply with the ITS, the agency  
12 must reinitiate consultation with FWS. 50 C.F.R. § 402.16.

13 1. Arbitrary and Capricious Supplemental Biological  
14 Opinion

15 The jeopardy and adverse modification determinations are  
16 made pursuant to governing regulations. To "'jeopardize the  
17 continued existence of' means to engage in an action that  
18 reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce  
19 appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a  
20 listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers,  
21 or distribution of that species." 50 C.F.R. § 402.02.

22 "Destruction or adverse modification means a direct or indirect  
23 alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical  
24 habitat for the conservation of a listed species." Id. The  
25 Ninth Circuit has held that the reviewing agency must consider  
26 both recovery and survival impacts in these determinations.  
27 Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n, 524 F.3d at 930 (9th Cir. 2007) (holding  
28 that the jeopardy definition requires consideration of recovery);

1 Gifford Pinchot Task Force, 378 F.3d at 1070 (holding that the  
2 adverse modification regulations “singular focus” on survival  
3 violated the ESA). However, it is not necessary that a federal  
4 action would itself implement or bring about recovery. Cascadia  
5 Wildlands v. Thrailkill, 49 F. Supp. 3d 774, 787 (D. Ore. 2014).

6 In making these determinations, an agency must use the best  
7 available scientific and commercial data available. 16 U.S.C.  
8 § 1536(a)(2); see San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Auth. v. Jewell,  
9 747 F.3d 581, 601-02 (9th Cir. 2014). Insufficient or incomplete  
10 information does not excuse an agency’s failure to comply where  
11 there was some additional superior information. Jewell, 747 F.3d  
12 at 602. However, “where the information is not readily  
13 available, we cannot insist on perfection.” Id. Where a  
14 plaintiff fails to point to data omitted from consideration, the  
15 claim fails. Kern Cnty. Farm Bureau v. Allen, 450 F.3d 1072,  
16 1081 (9th Cir. 2006).

17 Plaintiff provides four reasons why the operative BiOp, the  
18 Second Supplemental BiOp, fails to satisfy the ESA and is thus  
19 arbitrary and capricious.

20 First Plaintiff argues that the FWS’s determination that the  
21 Project will not jeopardize the NSO or adversely modify its  
22 critical habitat is irrational due to the FWS’s own contrary  
23 findings. P. MSJ at 26. Plaintiff directs the Court to a line  
24 in the BiOp where the FWS indicated that the Project is  
25 inconsistent with the 2011 RRP. FS-19319-20 (“The proposed  
26 action meets most of the recommendations of the Recovery Plan,  
27 but is inconsistent with portions of Recovery Action 10[.]”).  
28 Because the FWS must consider NSO recovery in its analysis,

1 Plaintiff argues that FWS's determination that the Project is  
2 inconsistent with "the critical recovery action" contradicts its  
3 jeopardy and adverse modification determinations. P. MSJ at 27.

4 The FWS adequately considered NSO recovery in its analysis,  
5 Plaintiff just does not agree with its conclusions. See FS-  
6 19319-21. First, the agency's finding that the Project is  
7 inconsistent with portions of one recovery action is not  
8 dispositive because the 2011 RRP, and the recommended recovery  
9 actions contained therein, is not a regulatory document and is  
10 not binding on the agency. See Conservation Cong. v. Finley, 774  
11 F.3d 611, 614 (9th Cir. 2014); Cascadia Wildlands v. Thrailkill,  
12 49 F. Supp. 3d at 787. Furthermore, a fair reading of the 2011  
13 RRP and Recovery Action 10 reveals that the plan anticipates the  
14 balance of competing forest management goals and acknowledges  
15 that short-term habitat degradation may sometimes be appropriate  
16 to achieve long-term forest health. See Conservation Cong. v.  
17 Heywood, 2:11-cv-02250, 2015 WL 5255346, at \*12 (E.D. Cal. Sep.  
18 9, 2015) ("Thus, the RRP does not recommend forgoing all land  
19 management activities to avoid short-term consequences to the  
20 NSO, and instead appears to support the proper implementation of  
21 projects like this."). The FWS's conclusion indicates the  
22 Project comports with this guidance: "Short-term adverse effects  
23 to [NSOs] in the action area due to project implementation are  
24 not expected to preclude recovery of the species in the recovery  
25 unit ICC or rangewide. Long-term, the Smokey Project will  
26 provide benefits to the [NSO] through increased resiliency of  
27 habitat." FS-19321. No violation is found on this basis.

28 ///

1 Plaintiff next argues that the FWS's endorsement of the  
2 placement of Activity Centers is not rationally connected to NSO  
3 habitat needs. P. MSJ at 27. Specifically, Plaintiff takes  
4 issue with the placement of Activity Center 3063 and directs the  
5 court to the USFS biologist's characterization of her work as a  
6 "crap shoot." FWS-2873. Plaintiff argues that this admission of  
7 "speculation and surmise" and "shoddy work" does not meet the  
8 requisite level of caution and expertise. P. MSJ at 27-28.

9 These comments occurred in the context of a larger  
10 conversation. In a phone meeting, employees from both services  
11 decided that two additional Activity Centers should be designated  
12 in the Project's action area and that the two MNF employees would  
13 "determine where to place the AC cite on the landscape, based on  
14 information from the 2013 survey report (the direction in which  
15 the pair flew off once they were offered mice) and the best  
16 habitat available." FWS-2872. Following that conversation, the  
17 USFS biologist sent the FWS biologist an email that said: "This  
18 new AC designation is going to be a crap shoot. Take a look in  
19 Google Earth - the best stuff looks to be about ½ mile east from  
20 the 2013 pair sighting." FS-2873. The biologists continued  
21 their consultation over email for several days, which involved  
22 multiple maps and images, survey data, and discussion of best  
23 suitable habitats. FWS-2873-81, 2887-88, 2901-04, 2926, 2930-31.  
24 The USFS biologist sent a map to FWS with the statement, "Here's  
25 my guess at what's nesting/roosting and foraging. Let me know  
26 what you think and I'll charge forward from there." FWS-2894.

27 Although the USFS's candid commentary may indicate that the  
28 new Activity Center was not determined to the degree of

1 scientific certainty Plaintiff desires, Plaintiff does not  
2 present any data that the agencies failed to consider in making  
3 the determination. Plaintiff refers to the FWS's Activity Center  
4 delineation "protocol," but the cited "protocol" says nothing  
5 about the way in which the agencies identify the location for a  
6 new activity center. See P. MSJ at 27 (citing FWS-1162) ("The  
7 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also uses a 0.5 mile radius circle  
8 around a [NSO] activity center to delineate the area most heavily  
9 used by the subspecies during the nesting season, also known as  
10 the core area."). Plaintiff states that the USFS located the  
11 core area associated with Activity Center 3063 "in such a way  
12 that the relevant NSO pair's nest site is outside of the core  
13 area." P. Rep. at 30. However, it does not appear that  
14 surveyors discovered an actual nest site, only that they detected  
15 owls that were "likely nesting," and the biologists based the  
16 activity center location on the direction the owls flew in and  
17 the habitat in the area. FS-19303; FWS-2872. Plaintiff's  
18 argument amounts to a challenge of the agencies' interpretation  
19 of the available data, to which this Court owes deference.

20 Third, Plaintiff argues that the BiOp fails to contain any  
21 analysis whatsoever of how the Project, together with other  
22 timber sale projects, will affect the continuing function of the  
23 Buttermilk LSR which is crucial to the conservation and continued  
24 survival of the NSO in northwestern California. P. MSJ at 28.  
25 The relevant regulations only require the agency to form an  
26 opinion as to whether the action, taken together with cumulative  
27 effects, is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of  
28 listed species or result in the destruction or adverse

1 modification of critical habitat. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(g).  
2 Plaintiff does not cite any authority for the proposition that  
3 the FWS needed to evaluate the continuing function of the  
4 Buttermilk LSR in its analysis. The Court will not impose such  
5 an obligation.

6 Finally, Plaintiff argues that the Operative BiOp is  
7 arbitrary and capricious because the LOP requirement in the  
8 Incidental Take Statement is different than the one in the 2012  
9 BiOp. Specifically, the Operative BiOp does not appear to  
10 protect unsurveyed nesting/roosting habitat in the event that  
11 protocol level survey information is not current/available, in  
12 contrast with the 2012 BiOp, which offers protection in that  
13 situation. P. MSJ at 28; compare FS-18792 with FS-19325.  
14 However, the Operative BiOp is based on the Second Supplemental  
15 BA, which states that it intends to incorporate the terms and  
16 conditions of the 2012 BiOp, and thus the original LOP. The  
17 conservation measures in the Supplemental BA must be implemented,  
18 see FS-19290, and thus the original LOP is incorporated into the  
19 BiOp; the Court need not determine whether it was arbitrary and  
20 capricious for the FWS to approve the Project with a differently  
21 worded LOP.

22 2. The USFS's Failure to Insure Against Jeopardy and  
23 the Destruction or Adverse Modification of  
24 Critical Habitat

25 Plaintiff claims that the USFS's authorization of the  
26 Project violates its substantive ESA Section 7(a)(2) duty not to  
27 undertake actions that "jeopardize" a listed species or  
28 "adversely modify" its habitat. P. MSJ at 29. Plaintiff argues  
that the USFS violated its obligations both because the BiOp is

1 legally flawed and because new information undercuts the BiOp.<sup>5</sup>

2 "Arbitrarily and capriciously relying on a faulty Biological  
3 Opinion" would violate an agency's Section 7 duties. Wild Fish  
4 Conservancy v. Salazar, 628 F.3d 513, 532 (9th Cir. 2010). "An  
5 agency's reliance on a biological opinion based on 'admittedly  
6 weak' information satisfies its ESA obligations as long as the  
7 challenging party can point to no new information undercutting  
8 the opinion's conclusions." Id.

9 Both of Plaintiff's arguments must fail. First, the Court  
10 has determined that the BiOp is legally sufficient. Further,  
11 contrary to Plaintiff's assertion in its Reply, the BiOp does  
12 address road maintenance activities. FS-19284. Second, the new  
13 information Plaintiff points to is the letter from the USFS to  
14 Trinity indicating which units will have a LOP if and when no  
15 current protocol level surveys are performed. ECF No. 86-1.  
16 This letter does not provide new information; it is the Forest  
17 Supervisor's interpretation of the Project's terms and  
18 conditions. As noted several times in this Order, the USFS will  
19 need to clarify the LOP so that the public and the agencies (and  
20 the courts) know what compliance looks like. However the Court  
21 does not hold, as a matter of law, that the USFS violated the ESA  
22 in issuing the letter.

### 23 3. USFS's Illegal and Prohibited Take

24 Plaintiff argues that because the BiOp is arbitrary and  
25 capricious, the Incidental Take Statement is invalid and all  
26

---

27 <sup>5</sup> This argument relies, in part, on a declaration that has been  
28 stricken from the record. The Court will not consider  
Plaintiff's argument based on that declaration.

1 incidental take will be unauthorized and illegal. Plaintiff's  
2 argument rests solely on the Court's determination with respect  
3 to the BiOp. As the Court has found that the BiOp is not  
4 arbitrary and capricious, this claim also fails.

5 E. NFMA Claim

6 "[T]he NFMA requires the Forest Service to develop a forest  
7 plan for each unit of the National Forest System." The Lands  
8 Council v. McNair, 537 F.3d 981, 988 (9th Cir. 2008); 16 U.S.C.  
9 § 1604(a). "After a forest plan is developed, all subsequent  
10 agency action, including site-specific plans . . . must comply  
11 with the NFMA and be consistent with the governing forest plan.  
12 Id. (citing Idaho Sporting Cong., Inc. v. Rittenhouse, 305 F.3d  
13 957. 962 (9th Cir. 2002)); 16 U.S.C. § 1604(i).

14 By its terms, the Mendocino National Forest Plan  
15 incorporates the NSO Recovery Plan. See Conservation Cong. v.  
16 U.S. Forest Service, No. 2:15-00249, 2016 WL 727272 (E.D. Cal.  
17 Feb. 24, 2016) (finding that a similarly worded forest plan  
18 incorporates the NSO Recovery Plan). The Forest Plan's "Summary  
19 of the Analysis of the Management Situation: Resource  
20 Environment" states, with respect to wildlife and fish:  
21 "Management activities will comply with species recovery plans  
22 (threatened and endangered species) and habitat management plans,  
23 as they apply to the Mendocino National Forest." P. MSJ at 20;  
24 FS-5811 (emphasis added). In a later section on "Management  
25 Direction: Management Prescriptions," the Plan states: "Late-  
26 Successional Reserves are to be managed to protect and enhance  
27 conditions of late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystems,  
28 which serve as habitat for late-successional and old-growth

1 related species including the northern spotted owl. . . .  
2 Activities required by recovery plans for listed threatened and  
3 endangered species take precedence over LSR standards and  
4 guidelines." FS-5819 (emphasis added).

5 Plaintiff argues that the Project violates the 2011 RRP for  
6 the NSO and is thus inconsistent with the Forest Plan and  
7 violates the NFMA. P. MSJ at 20. Defendants argue that the plan  
8 does not impose mandatory requirements. D. Cr. Mot. at 20.

9 Although "recovery plan objectives are discretionary for  
10 federal agencies," Heywood, 2015 WL 5255346, at \*1, that rule  
11 does not end the Court's inquiry. "[W]here an otherwise advisory  
12 document has been clearly incorporated into a Forest Plan or  
13 other binding document, its requirements become mandatory."

14 Ecology Ctr. v. Castaneda, 574 F.3d 652, 660 (9th Cir. 2009).  
15 When such a document is incorporated into a forest plan, courts  
16 look to the language of the guideline to determine whether it  
17 creates a mandatory standard. Id. at 660. "[T]he presence of a  
18 few, isolated provisions cast in mandatory language does not  
19 transform an otherwise suggestive set of guidelines into binding  
20 regulations." Id. "If the guideline language underlying the  
21 plaintiff's claim is merely advisory or aspirational, the answer  
22 must be 'no.'" Id. For instance, where a Forest Plan  
23 incorporated "Old Growth Guidelines," the Ninth Circuit declined  
24 to mandate compliance because the relevant portions were cast in  
25 suggestive (i.e. "should" and "may") rather than mandatory  
26 ("must" and "only") terms. Id. at 660-61.

27 Applying these principles to the present dispute, it is  
28 clear that the cited sections of the 2011 RRP are merely

1 suggestive and do not impose mandatory terms on the USFS.

2 Plaintiff first argues that the Project violates Recovery  
3 Action 10. In the 2014 and 2015 BiOps, the FWS expressly found  
4 that the Project "is inconsistent with portions of Recovery  
5 Action 10" in the 2014 BiOp as proof of this claim. P. MSJ at  
6 20. The Recovery Action recommends that the USFS "retain and  
7 protect all current and historically occupied NSO habitat." P.  
8 Rep at 19-20.

9 The Court finds that the language of Recovery Action 10 is  
10 suggestive and framed in a manner that anticipates the balancing  
11 of competing goals. The RRP's Executive Summary defines Recovery  
12 Actions as "near-term recommendations to guide the activities  
13 needed to accomplish the recovery objectives and achieve the  
14 recovery criteria." FS-4239. Further, most of Recovery Action  
15 10 consists of "interim guidance." This guidance suggests (i.e.  
16 "Land managers should . . .") priorities for consideration, but  
17 recognizes the need for balance:

18 As a general rule, forest management activities that  
19 are likely to diminish a home range's capability to  
20 support spotted owl occupancy, survival and  
21 reproduction in the long-term should be discouraged.  
22 However, we recognize that land managers have a variety  
23 of forest management obligations and that spotted owls  
24 may not be the sole driver in these decisions. Here,  
25 active forest management may be necessary to maintain  
26 or improve ecological conditions.

23 FS-4311-12. The Court cannot read this section to impose  
24 mandatory requirements on the USFS and thus it does not find a  
25 violation.

26 Plaintiff also contends that the Project is inconsistent  
27 with the adaptive management approach to forest management that  
28 the RRP prescribes. See P. Rep. at 3-7. While Plaintiff is

1 correct that adaptive management receives special emphasis in the  
2 2011 RRP, these objectives do not impose mandatory requirements  
3 on the USFS for specific projects. The RRP explains:

4 In order to deal with uncertainty and risk the Service  
5 will employ an active program of adaptive management.  
6 Adaptive management includes identifying areas of  
7 uncertainty and risk, implementing a research and  
8 monitoring approach to clarify these areas, and making  
9 decisions to change management direction that is not  
10 working while still maintaining management flexibility.  
11 Where possible, the implementation of the recovery  
12 actions included within this Revised Recovery Plan  
13 should be designed in a manner that provides feedback  
14 on the efficacy of management actions such that the  
15 design of future actions can be improved.

16 FS-4260 (emphasis added). Adaptive management is thus a tool  
17 that the FWS intends to use to gather knowledge for best managing  
18 the species. See FS-4262. FS-4280. The Court cannot read these  
19 objectives to require that every project be implemented with  
20 "rigorous monitoring and [an] adaptive management program"  
21 attached. See P. MSJ at 4. Again, there is no violation.

22 In its Reply, Plaintiff argues that the cutting of larger  
23 trees and simplification of vertical and horizontal structures  
24 violate the 2011 RRP. P. Rep. at 5-6. The Court finds that the  
25 sections Plaintiff cites are also cast as "recommendations" and  
26 do not impose mandatory obligations on the USFS. See, e.g., FS-  
27 4253 ("In order to reduce or not increase this potential  
28 competitive pressure while the threat from barred owls is being  
addressed, this Revised Recovery Plan now recommends conserving  
and restoring older, multi-layered forest across the range of the  
spotted owl."). The USFS did not violate the RRP for these  
reasons either.

///  
28

